

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed November 25, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

**I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-5, 8, 11, 16-18, 21, 22, 24-27, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chong* in view of *Hanawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,630). 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 19, 20, 23, 28, 30, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chong* in view of *Hanawa* in further view of *Adamske* (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,234). Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chong* in view of *Hanawa* in further view of *Adamske* in further view of *Nakamura* (U.S. Patent No. 6,064, 836). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant's independent claim 1 provides as follows:

1. A method for facilitating generation of a hard copy, comprising:
  - selecting a document file written in a first language;
  - selecting a translator file configured to translate the document file into a second language of specialized commands of specialized commands for a hard copy generation device, the specialized commands enabling a hard copy of the document file to be produced at the hard copy generation device;* and
  - packaging the document file and the translator file together in a job package that can be received by the hard copy generation device.

(Emphasis added).

Regarding the limitations of claim 1, the Office Action acknowledges that "*Chong* fails to explicitly teach selecting a translator file and packaging the document

file and translator together in a job package that can be received by a hard copy generation device." The Office Action further states: "However, *Hanawa* teaches packaging and transmission of the conversion program with the e-mail message (col. 10 line 54-col. 11 line 55)," with no mentioning of selecting a translator file. Office Action, page 3. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made.

Further, with regard to *Hanawa*, it appears to teach or suggest at most a process whereby a character code is read from a received E-mail (S24) and the font data corresponding to the character code is obtained (S26) and then it is determined whether the character is designated as a dynamic font (S28) and if so, the font data is converted into bit map data (S34) for producing a soft copy, such as on a display screen. See Fig. 4; cols. 11-12, lines 43-10; and [http://http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=%2Fsupport%2Fglossary%2Fs.asp#softcopy](http://support.microsoft.com/default.aspx?scid=%2Fsupport%2Fglossary%2Fs.asp#softcopy) (where soft copy is defined as "The temporary images presented on a computer display screen. Compare hard copy.")

Thus, *Hanawa* and *Chong* fail to teach or suggest at least "selecting a translator file configured to translate the document file into a second language of specialized commands for a hard copy generation device, the specialized commands enabling a hard copy of the document file to be produced at the hard copy generation device," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added). For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, where *Chong* seemingly teaches designating a spoken language selection on a cover page of a document, *Hanawa* diversely teaches a conversion program for displaying a dynamic font on a display screen. Thus, the combination of the two references does not appear to produce the claimed subject matter, including the step of "selecting a translator file configured to translate the document file into a

second language of specialized commands for a hard copy generation device, the specialized commands enabling a hard copy of the document file to be produced at the hard copy generation device." For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

*Chong* in view of *Hanawa* is similarly deficient as to Applicant's independent claims 8, 11, 18, 21, and 24. Those claims respectively require "means for selecting a translator file configured to translate the document file into a second language of specialized commands for a hard copy generation device, the specialized commands enabling a hard copy of the document file to be produced at the hard copy generation device," "receiving a job package comprising a document file representing a document, the document file written in a first language, and a translator file configured to translate the document file into a second language of specialized commands for producing a hard copy of the document file at a hard copy generation device," "means for receiving a job package comprising a document file representative of a document, the document file written in a first language and a translator file configured to translate the document file into a second language of specialized commands for producing a hard copy of the document file at a hard copy generation device," "receiving an address that identifies the location of a job package that comprises a document file representative of a document, the document file written in a first language and a translator file configured to translate the document file into a second language of specialized commands for producing a hard copy of the document file at a hard copy generation device," and "means for using the translator file to translate the document file into the second language of specialized commands for producing a hard copy of the document file at a hard copy generation device," which are not suggested or taught by *Chong* or *Hanawa*.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Chong* in view of *Hanawa* does not teach or suggest Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, 11, 18, 21, and 24 and claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-17, 19-20, 22-23, and 25-32 which respectively depend therefrom. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.


Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for the allowability of claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-17, 19-20, 22-23, and 25-32, these dependent claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Hence, there are other reasons why these dependent claims are allowable.

As an illustrative example, with reference to claim 30, none of the cited references in the proposed combination of *Chong* in view of *Hanawa* in further view of *Adamske* disclose "wherein appending an address comprises appending a universal resource locator (URL) that identifies the location of the decryption key," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added). For example, *Adamske* seemingly teaches that a URL is used to enable users to electronically sign documents. See col. 8, lines 46-51. For at least this reason, this claim and the other pending claims should be allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Charles W. Griggers  
Registration No. 47,283

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**